



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,583	10/06/2000	Mike G. Gyde	H0001641	1855

7590 08/13/2007
Honeywell International Inc
Law Department AB2
P O Box 2245
Morristown, NJ 07962-9806

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/13/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/680,583

Applicant(s)

GYDE ET AL.

Examiner

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's request for reconsideration filed 04/23/07 has been entered and carefully considered. Arguments regarding rejections under 35.U.S.C 103 to claims 18-30 are persuasive. However, the limitations of these claims have not been found to be patentable over newly discovered prior art, therefore claims 18-30 are rejected under the new ground of rejection as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 18-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messinger et al. [US. 7,000,187] in view of Durlacher et al. [US. 6,633,801].

As to claims 18, 23 and 25, Messinger et al. disclose a method/apparatus for displaying a checklist on a display comprising:

displaying a first layout comprising the checklist (figure 9), the checklist displayed on a first section of the display and including a plurality of tasks (figure 9, 400), at least one task capable of receiving user input (column 5, lines 57-67); determining whether to display data related to a first task of the plurality of tasks (figure 9, 50, column 6, lines 15-25); storing the first layout in a memory, if a determination is made to display the data related to the first task (column 6, lines 13-40); displaying a second layout without user input comprising the checklist and the data related to the first task if a determination is made to display the data related to the first task (figures 9-10, column 7, line 60 through column 8, line 20), the checklist displayed on the first section of the display and the data related to the first task displayed on a second section of the display (figure 9, the first section 400 and the second section 50);

Durlacher et al. fail to clearly teach or suggest the aircraft data nor determining whether to display data related to a second task of the plurality of tasks; retrieving the stored first layout from the memory, if a determination is made not to display the data related to the second task; and displaying the stored first

Art Unit: 2179

layout, if a determination is made not to display the data related to the second task, after displaying the second layout and without receiving a user input.

However, Durlacher et al. also teach aircraft checklist (figure 5A and 5D); determining whether to display data related to a second task of the plurality of tasks (figure 5D, the second task "Inflight"); retrieving the stored first layout from the memory, if a determination is made not to display the data related to the second task (figure 5A, 5D, and 7A, column 6, line 53 through column 7, line 55);

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Messinger's teaching with the Durlacher's method in order to navigate back to a main menu for activating a new task.

As to claims 19 and 26, Durlacher also discloses the aircraft data related to the first task comprising synoptic data (figure 5A). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Messinger's teaching with the Durlacher's method in order to navigate back to a main menu for activating a new task.

As to claims 20 and 27, Messinger et al. disclose the checklist comprising a second task and the step of displaying comprising indicating the first task as being a current task (figures 9-10, "Step 1" is highlighted).

As to claims 21 and 28, Messinger et al. disclose indicating the second task as being the current task (figure 10, "Step 2" is highlighted to indicate the current task).

As to claims 22 and 29, Messinger also discloses determining whether to display data related to the second task (figure 10); and displaying a third layout comprising the checklist (figure 10), and the data related to the second task, if a determination is made to display the data related to the second task, the checklist displayed on the first section of the display and the data related to the second task displayed on a second section of the display (figures 10-11, column 10, line 50 through column 11m 55). Messinger fails to clearly teach the aircraft data. However, Durlacher teaches the feature (see abstract). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Messinger's teaching with the Durlacher's method in order to navigate back to a main menu for activating a new task.

As to claim 24, Messinger discloses indicating an end of the checklist on the display (figures 9-11).

As to claim 30, Messinger also discloses displaying the first layout, after displaying the fourth layout and receiving a third user input (figures 10-11).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4141.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo, can be reached at 571-272-4847.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER